

KLE

Printed by HPS Server
for

Walk-Up_Printing

Printer: cpk2_2c21_gblrprr

Date: 11/24/03

Time: 13:14:04

Document Listing

Document	Selected Pages	Page Range	Copies
US005018061	7	1 - 7	1
US005029126	5	1 - 5	1
US005845309	17	1 - 17	1
US005715426	14	1 - 14	1
US005913223	11	1 - 11	1
US006549986	11	1 - 11	1
US006356990	8	1 - 8	1
US006449694	11	1 - 11	1
US006021461	11	1 - 11	1
US006412059	23	1 - 23	1
Total (10)	118	-	-

VI. DETERMINE WHETHER THE CLAIMED INVENTION COMPLIES WITH 35 U.S.C. 102 AND 103

As is the case for inventions in any field of technology, assessment of a claimed computer-related invention for compliance with 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 begins with a comparison of the claimed subject matter to what is known in the prior art. If no differences are found between the claimed invention and the prior art, the claimed invention lacks novelty and is to be rejected by Office personnel under 35 U.S.C. 102. Once distinctions are identified between the claimed invention and the prior art, those distinctions must be assessed and resolved in light of the knowledge possessed by a person of ordinary skill in the art. Against this backdrop, one must determine whether the invention would have been obvious at the time the invention was made. If not, the claimed invention satisfies 35 U.S.C. 103. Factors and considerations dictated by law governing 35 U.S.C. 103 apply without modification to computer-related inventions. Moreover, merely using a computer to automate a known process does not by itself impart nonobviousness to the invention. See *Dann v. Johnston*, 425 U.S. 219, 227-30, 189 USPQ 257, 261 (1976); *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958).